

in a variety of ways. We leave this up to the presiding officer to put in by rule, but the important thing is that when you send a man to Annapolis to represent you and when you ask him how he stands and what he believes on a particular piece of legislation and what did he do about it, you have a chance then to go and look at the record instead of just listening to what he says, or somebody else says, about it.

This is a very fundamental part of raising the visibility of the legislative process. I very much regret the leaders of the legislature do not support this. I think after it has been in existence a year if it ever gets in existence, they will wonder how they ever did without it.

This afternoon I talked to the official reporter of the United States Senate. I told him precisely the problem we have in this Convention. He said, "Aren't those people concerned about the legislative history, the traditions that support a piece of legislation." He said he did not understand how they could possibly get by without it. He said your problem is much simpler than his, because he deals with 535 members of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate. In Annapolis there is a much smaller number. There they are in session all the year long practically. Here they are in session ninety days. It is an entirely different situation. The people have a right to know what is going on. The lawyers have a right to know what a law means. The judges have a right to know what a law means. There is no cause for knocking this out of the constitution. I would hope this amendment is supported.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Henderson.

DELEGATE HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to keeping this provision about the transcript in, not because of its cost which may or may not be excessive. If it were a good thing I would not consider that the cost would be a controlling factor, but rather I think it is of dubious utility. I simply do not think it is worthwhile preserving the debates on the floor of this General Assembly. We have never had this in Maryland before. The courts have decided questions involving legislative intent from the beginning of our statehood without the benefit of such debates and the courts rely upon various things, such as the reports of the commissions that recommend laws. They will have available the reports of the committees when these bills are brought to the floor. In the case of the rules of court which are adopted, they have the commentary, and the statement of intent

following each section which is now published as a separate article of the Code.

I just fear that if this happens, the work of the legislature will be slowed down and encumbered by something which will be of no value whatsoever because what you hear in debates is very much like what we hear on the floor here, a lot of conflicting views and no one can get much help from that, I gather, as to what the real intent of the legislation was. It just seems to me that it is a futile proposition which would interfere with the real work of the legislature, and other devices will be found which will more clearly indicate what that intent is.

THE PRESIDENT: Delegate Case.

DELEGATE CASE: I move the previous question.

THE PRESIDENT: There is a motion that the previous question be ordered on the adoption of Amendment No. 11.

All those in favor, signify by saying Aye; contrary, No.

The Ayes have it. It is so ordered.

For what reason does Delegate Gleason rise?

DELEGATE GLEASON: Parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDENT: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE GLEASON: Will you state the amendment for us again before we vote?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. The question arises on the adoption of Amendment No. 11 to Committee Recommendation LB-1, LB-2, and LB-3 as amended by S&D-16. Amendment No. 11 deletes from page 7, section 3.19, line 17, the words "and for a transcript of its debates," so that if the words are deleted, section 3.19 would read "Each House of the General Assembly shall provide by rule for a current daily journal of its proceedings which shall be open to public inspection at all reasonable times."

If the amendment is deleted, the additional words would remain in section 3.19. The question arises now on the adoption of Amendment No. 11. A vote Aye is a vote in favor of the Amendment No. 11, in favor of the deletion. A vote No is a vote against.

Cast your vote.

Has every delegate voted?

Delegate Boileau.